

**REMARKS**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claim 22 has been amended (claims 22-25 were objected to), claims 26-35 stand allowed, and claims 18-21 stand rejected. Accordingly, claims 18-35 are presently under consideration in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

**II. POWER OF ATTORNEY/CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS/ONE-MONTH EXTENSION OF TIME**

Attached to this Reply, in Exhibit A, are the following documents:

1. Revocation of Power of Attorney or Authorization of Agent,
2. Power of Attorney, and
3. Statement Under 37 C.F.R. § 3.73(b) and a copy of an Assignment Recordation Cover Sheet/Assignment document for the present application.

In addition, Applicants' undersigned representative notes the change in correspondence address. Submitted herewith under separate cover is a Petition for One-Month Extension of Time, allowing for a timely response through June 11, 2003.

**III. CLAIM FOR DOMESTIC PRIORITY UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 120**

The specification of the present application has been amended in conformance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.78 to make specific reference to the parent application Serial No. 09/185,558 filed 11/04/1998, now abandoned. Applicants respectfully request a corrected Official Filing Receipt.

**IV. CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi (U.S. 4,925,424) and Yamashita et al. (U.S. 4,855,652). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully contend that even were it proper (which it is not) to combine Yamashita with Takahashi, not all of the limitations would be met. In particular, claim 18 positively recites "a control arrangement, coupled to the transducer to receive rotational information and configured and arranged to cause power to be applied to the motor at different times based on at least the rotational information provided by the transducer."

Neither Takahashi nor Yamashita et al. can satisfy this recitation. In particular, while Yamashita et al. include a position detection circuit 8, such position detecting signals 14 produced from circuit 8 in Yamashita et al. are not used by "a control arrangement . . . to cause power to be applied to the motor at different times **based on** at least the rotational information provided by the transducer." In contrast, in Yamashita et al. the three position detecting signals are disclosed only for use in generating a motor speed. In this regard, the position detecting circuit 8 in Yamashita et al. may as well be a motor speed detecting circuit. The Office's attention is respectfully directed to column 4, lines 26-56:

Referring to FIG. 3, each phase of the three position detecting signals 14 is delayed by 60°. The microcomputer 6 measures times  $t_1 - t_6$  in each 60°, and obtains the time T of one cycle to detect the speed of the synchronous motor 5.

Referring to FIG. 4 which shows the steps for forming the current instruction signal 19, step 41 calculates an instruction speed signal Nr. Based on the speed instruction signal 15 supplied from outside of the microcomputer 6. Step 42 obtains the one cycle time T of the position detecting signal. Step 43 calculates the rotational speed N of the motor based on the time T of the one cycle and a proportional constant K.

\* \* \* \* \*

By repeating and practicing the speed control procedure explained above, the current instruction signal is revised until the instruction speed signal Nr equals the detected speed N, and the root square mean value of the power supply current 10 is determined.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Yamashita et al. do not disclose an arrangement to cause power to be applied to the motor at different times **based on at least the rotational information provided by the transducer**. Accordingly, even were it proper to combine Takahashi and Yamashita et al., not all of the limitations of claim 18 would be satisfied. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Additionally, claims 19-21 depend from (directly or indirectly) base claim 18, and therefore contain all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with Applicants' response to the rejection of claim 18, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejected dependent claims 19-21.

09/702,466  
69,010-237

**V. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 26-35 have been allowed.

Applicants further appreciate the indication that claims 22-25 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 22 has been rewritten in independent form. Claims 23-25 depend from, directly or indirectly, claim 22, as amended. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 22-25 are now in a form for allowance.

**VI. CONCLUSION**

For at least the above cited reasons, all claims pending in this Application are now believed to be allowable. Early receipt of a Notice of Allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



John W. Rees, Reg. No. 38,278  
Dykema Gossett PLLC  
39577 Woodward Avenue, Suite 300  
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-5086  
(248) 203-0832  
jrees@dykema.com

Date: June 11, 2003